DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 954 SO 021 324

AUTHOR Schuster, Marilyn R.; Van Dyne, Susan R.
TITLE Feminist Transformation of the Curriculum: The Changing Classroom, Changing the Institution. Working Paper No. 125.
INSTITUTION Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
SPONS AGENCY Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 39p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($4.00, plus postage).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *Classroom Environment; *Consciousness Raising; Cultural Awareness; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Problems; *Educational Philosophy; *Feminism; Higher Education; Social Science Research; *Teaching Models; Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

Feminist scholarship has given a multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective to education that has produced an impatience with curriculum that is predominantly white, male, Western, and heterosexist in its assumptions. This approach to education tends to see invisible paradigms of the academic system and the larger cultural context that marginalize or trivialize the lives of all those outside the dominant class or culture. To understand the process of curriculum transformation, this research began with the classroom and ended with conceptual models for institutional change. Five key questions were asked: (1) Who can change? (2) What is the stimulus for change? (3) What are the forces and forms of resistance? (4) What is the locus for change? and (5) How do we measure change? Within the changing classroom, the issues focued on rising expectations of women, women-focused classrooms, women teaching, women learning, and conflict as an agent for change. Changing the institution requires an assessment of change in a context of crisis, of women's studies and transformation, and of curriculum transformation. Curriculum transformation projects have at least three common characteristics: (1) long term sources of funding developed within the institution; (2) long range commitment to faculty development at all levels; and (3) a means to continue to involve more faculty and adminstrators in the transformation effort. Three curriculum models, a top-down model, a piggy-back model, and a consortial model, are discussed and analyzed in relation to the five key questions. It was concluded, from the experience with all these models, that when real transformation begins to happen individuals also need to recognize the pervasive and unconscious ways in which the dominant culture is reproduced in the classroom. (KM)

SO 021 324

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARILYN R. SCHUSTER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRANSFORMING THE CURRICULUM:
THE CHANGING CLASSROOM, CHANGING THE INSTITUTION

I. THE CHANGING CLASSROOM

The desire to transform the traditional curriculum emerges from a pattern of rising and sometimes conflicting expectations. The explosion of scholarship on women in the last two decades has led many of us in women's studies to want to change courses throughout the curriculum. The multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective that feminist scholarship has produced makes us impatient with a curriculum that is predominantly white, male, Western and heterosexist in its assumptions. The development of women's studies has made possible not only a critique of the organization of knowledge in the traditional curriculum but of the exercise of power in the classroom and of the political structures of the institutions in which we operate. Women's studies has enabled us to see in all areas what we've come to call the "invisible paradigms" of the academic system and the larger cultural context that marginalize or trivialize the lives of all women, the lives of Blacks and of ethnic minorities, and those outside the dominant class or culture.

Where does the process of transforming the traditional curriculum take place? We couldn't begin without the sound scholarship and creative anthologies produced in the last decade; and without continuing faculty development and theoretical analysis, we couldn't go on to imagine broader, more systemic change. Our analysis begins with the crucible of the classroom and ends with conceptual models for institutional change. To understand the process of curriculum transformation we need to focus on these key questions: who can change? what is the stimulus for change? what are the forces and forms of resistance? what is the locus for change? how do we measure change?

Rising expectations: conflict at the core

Rising expectations and diminishing resources define the context in which curriculum transformation must take place. Presidents, provosts, and deans of women's colleges and co-ed institutions alike are aware of the need to attract women students as consumers and to educate them for a productive adult life. Attracting the woman student, the majority in the shrinking college applicant pool, and serving her well may be the keys for survival in the 90's for both types of institutions.

Our women students certainly have rising expectations about the value of higher education to prepare them for high-paying, high-status employment. Most women students have faith that the values and skills of a traditional liberal education will fit them for a productive adult life; they expect, on graduation, to

succeed in the culture as it's now constructed. They expect to match the culture's paradigms of worth and achievement rather than to change them. At the same time that they expect liberal arts study to widen for them the career paths once travelled mostly by men, women have given up none of their faith in personal fulfillment through affinity relationships and caretaking networks, in whatever forms these are structured.

A crucial irony exists here. Women students' rising expectations expose a fundamental conflict between our culture's ideology of the liberally educated person and the actual possibilities in that culture for a liberally educated woman. Women students in the last decade, for the most part, did not question the values of their traditional education as much as the profound lack of fit between their education and what they expected to achieve by virtue of it. They questioned the surprising disjuncture between the male values they espoused as if they were their own and their lived experience as women. The current college generation of women students feels entitled, largely as the legacy of the women's movement, to a new image of themselves as innately valuable, intellectually competent, and socially equal to men. Yet they must confront during and after college a culture still shaped by and serving primarily the needs of men. Their traditional education gives them no adequate means of bridging this gap, nor of adequately understanding their own experience in the context of this culture.

Such a rupture in the story of the rising expectations of our women students is one of the many gaps that causes us as administrators and faculty to question the very nature of the liberal arts curriculum we once assumed would serve women and men equitably. Our advances in transforming the traditional curriculum have come so far through a process of negative definition: we begin to know what is needed by cataloging what is missing or marginalized. Reimagining the core of the liberal arts curriculum, then, means exposing the conflict between opposing world views: an exclusive, white, male, Western European view of human experience that calls itself humanist, in contrast to a much more inclusive vision of critical differences in gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background. For us, one of the most important lessons of the last decade has been to recognize the profound conflict inherent in reconceptualizing the curriculum.

The Woman-focused classroom: invisible paradigms made visible

Whenever women enter the classroom, there's sure to be trouble. We want to analyze women's presence in at least three dimensions: 1) as the subject of study on the syllabus, 2) as female faculty members in the classroom and within the institution, and 3) as women students. Although we intend to identify why and how women's presence in any of these guises is inherently disruptive of old certainties and civilities, our goal is to demonstrate how women's presence in the classroom in all three roles is potentially transformative of higher education's

entire shape and substance.

We'd like to analyze a case that initially seems atypical, rarefied, or even Utopian: the woman-focused classroom. What we call a woman-focused classroom could occur in a women's studies course at a co-ed institution as well as in the examples we've known in a women's college. What we mean to describe is a context in which women students are the overwhelming majority of the class, in which the professor is a woman who exposes her class to a reflection of human experience that not only includes women but also draws attention to racial, cultural and class diversity.

A woman-focused classroom brings previously invisible paradigms into sharp relief. These are the skeletons in the closet or even the most liberal institutions. These are, to use another image to make the invisible visible, the infrastructure of our academic system. For us, the invisible paradigms are the internalized assumptions, the network of unspoken agreements, the implicit contracts that all the participants in the process of higher education have agreed to, usually unconsciously, in order to bring about learning. This infrastructure has worked so long and supported the commerce of higher education so effectively that we no longer see it, notice its presence or, most importantly, name it for the determining force that it is. Not surprisingly, these invisible paradigms are organized around power (who has it and how we're allowed access to it) and around values (among available choices, what is important and what is best). The invisible paradigms govern not only the content and

organization or our syllabus, but the way we claim and exercise authority in the classroom and, in addition, what students expect to get from us as teachers and for themselves by becoming educated.

The syllabus, the teacher, the classroom--what happens to each when women are not marginal but appear instead as conspicuously central? What may be surprising is that such a radical alteration of familiar patterns may never forget or exclude the world of men in the ways that the traditional classroom often forgets and excludes the presence of women. The male-defined world intrudes and colors experience even here. Nonetheless, the ultimate goal of such a fresh configuration is to transform the vision of men as much as of women.

The Shape of the syllabus

Women are extremely problematic when they appear on the conventional syllabus. Their example refuses to confirm our inherited methods of interpretation or criteria for judgment. We see the shapes that formerly structured our knowledge most clearly when we try to include something that distorts them. Attempting to be attentive to differences not only between genders, but for ethnic groups, socioeconomic backgrounds, and chosen lifestyles, we are forcibly reminded how often traditional syllabi are founded on the demonstration of sameness. We've called this the "fountainhead" paradigm of syllabus design or "reproduction by analogy." Courses that are designed according to

this paradigm could cover a series of major thinkers, a sequence of major art or literary works, the progression of historical periods or social movements. In teaching courses like these, we've conventionally agreed we know where to start: we start at the fountainhead, or with the first instance of greatness. The hidden power of this paradigm lies in what we agree to call the first instance, for this primary example often serves to define how everything that follows it on the syllabus will be perceived. Whether we begin with Aristotle, the Parthenon, or the genesis myth, the framework derived from these fountainheads becomes the lens through which we see the rest. Other phenomena or other angles of vision will be valued according to the degree they can be accommodated to the initial perspective, that is, to the extent they are analogous to the original.

Most courses also organize knowledge incrementally and chronologically. The significance of such linear arrangements may be implicitly progressive or nostalgic. In every case, the order of items on the syllabus is always value-laden and is never perceived as merely random. Some simplistic examples. In the sciences the linear unraveling of nature's mysteries may represent a history of advancement and enlightenment, with new data correcting and completing the past. In literature and the arts, the contemporary production may as often be described as a falling off from an earlier golden age. Some accounts of social organization may likewise assume an evolutionary tendency toward an ideal state or may posit a harmonious initial community prior to recorded history. Whatever form it takes, the syllabus whose

invisible paradigm is the fountainhead or which reproduces greatness by analogy with the primary example can never do full justice to difference. These paradigms exist to demonstrate likeness instead. When differences are multiple rather than simply dualistic, such paradigms of syllabus design serve us even worse.

Historically, our first attempts to transform the conventional syllabus by being more inclusive of the lives of women, minority groups, and different classes revealed extensive subcultures, vast strata of experience previously invisible. Yet simple inclusion of the new knowledge within the inherited framework was problematic because the invisible paradigms continued to control our interpretation of the fresh data. As long as we agreed to view women through the lens of the dominant group or gender, the most noticeable characteristic of their experience was oppression. Fortunately, the example of Black studies offers alternatives to this analysis. If we adopt an insider's view, rather than the exclusionary perspective of the conventionally designed syllabus, we realize that the identities of women are richly diverse and can be defined independent of the dominant group.

How much power these paradigms still hold, even after we know their failings, may be unintentionally confirmed in our designs for women-focused courses. We've been more successful so far in developing courses that treat women's history or women's literature in its own terms, apart from men's. Constructing a separate account of women's experience allows us to demonstrate

the reassuring pattern of development through time and to generalize from a sample that may have more similarities than differences. We have yet to learn how to put the world of women's and men's experience back together again, for that re-vision would demand reconceiving the entire paradigm. In the process of genuine transformation we must be willing to create a syllabus whose outer boundaries are in constant flux. What belongs on the syllabus will be a matter for open and almost constant debate. At times it seems nothing can be omitted from it. The discipline of being rigorously interdisciplinary yields a syllabus that is unwieldy and impure by the conventional standards of most departments.

In our analysis, the process of curriculum transformation is marked by the conflict between our attempts to order knowledge more inclusively and the stubborn structures of these invisible paradigms. In our experience, the very process of trying to replace them serves to remind us how intransigent they are. Yet we are ready to claim significant progress has been made by bringing these invisible, unspoken assumptions into the light of critical scrutiny where their power can be self-consciously articulated and, with care, combated.

Women teaching: changing the terms of authority

What unspoken power relations surface when women appear at the head of the classroom (or when a woman teacher occupies one of the chairs in a circle of students)? Even though women's

colleges succeed in making greater numbers of women teachers available to women students than in co-ed environments, our experience suggests we need to move beyond an analysis that identifies women teachers simply as role models and mentors to be emulated. In practice what women teachers represent to women students is often highly conflicted and may provoke as much denial from students as desire. As Jean Baker Miller suggests, the teacher/student relationship is founded on an assumption of temporary inequality in which the goal of the participant with more power or knowledge is to end or reduce that inequality by sharing these resources.(1) Yet the temporary inequality of the teacher/student relationship is enmeshed in a cultural context of more permanent inequalities, in which dominant groups such as men and whites inhibit access to their power by subordinate groups such as women and non-whites.

Who is the woman teacher to her students? She possesses the power attributed to her institutionally as teacher and yet her explicit goal is often to empower her students by sharing her authority. She holds the keys to mastery of a subject, yet her concern for students' growth is often described as nurturing. In claiming her own personal authority in the classroom, the woman teacher cannot fully shed the patriarchal culture's definition of her gender. Because her status for students remains embedded in a social context of male/female permanent inequalities, their prior cultural conditioning is an omnipresent invisible paradigm even in a woman-focused classroom.(2) In her powerful role as teacher, a woman may be perceived as having the conflicting

attributes of mother and father at once and therefore may provoke deeply ambivalent responses. As analogous to the mother figure, the woman teacher is seen as a source of comfort, sustenance and possible identification. Yet she may be feared as encouraging dependency. She also resembles a father figure to students in her enviable authority, imagined autonomy, and in the occupational necessity she has to judge, evaluate, and possibly reject them.(3)

A further complication is added when the woman teacher, whose explicit goal is to empower women students by sharing her authority with them, attempts to present an inclusive picture of human experience, part of which is the discomforting recognition of women's history of oppression. The students' initial reaction is that a good mother wouldn't bear such bad tidings. Our students experience understandable discomfort at being displaced from androcentric definitions of the good, the true, and the beautiful, definitions they could imagine included them when evidence about women's experience was entirely lacking in the curriculum. We find their initial reaction to having women on the syllabus is grief at the loss of earlier illusions. To avoid perceiving themselves as losers according to the dominant culture's definition, they may struggle to assert behavior and values that correspond more nearly to the dominant group. Or they may cling to a faith in an individual solution, believing that the picture of women as a group may be representative of another historical time or place, but that their own merit and discernment will allow a different and superior fate for

themselves.

The discomfort experienced in the woman-focused classroom is not one-sided. When we as women teachers present women's experience, we must also confess our ignorance and awkwardness. Teaching about women is, in Peggy McIntosh's phrase, "hazardous to the ego."(4) We frequently appear both passionately political and puzzlingly tentative in our presentations of this material. We candidly identify our biases because we intend not to deceive our students with the old myth that humanistic learning is value-free and objective. Moreover, because we're aware that knowledge and modes of understanding are historical by nature, we carefully qualify our assertions and resist global, eternal claims for our new truths.

All of these factors should alert us that a woman student's alliance with a woman teacher who would be her mentor (and is, whether she chooses to be or not, a complex role model) is not at all simple, easy or certain. We don't mean to deny that the greater presence of women teachers on women's college campuses, and in women's studies courses elsewhere, is a significant advantage to women students.(5) Only by appearing in significant numbers can we mirror for students the range of possibilities of being adult and female. Yet we should recognize that in this mirror the woman student is likely to project images of women that the culture has drawn for her, including self-doubt and low self-esteem, as well as to see reflected in her teacher attributes or power and possibility that she might claim for herself.

Women learning: a pedagogy of empowerment

Power relationships, we've been arguing, are at the root of these invisible paradigms. How is power felt in the woman-focused classroom? Frequently our pedagogy departs intentionally from conventional models. The same critique which transforms the traditional syllabus in order to take women seriously as a legitimate subject of study and which strives to examine women's experience in its own terms, reminds the teacher to respect an individual student's right to report her own experience. Aware that power may have been hoarded by dominant groups to the disadvantage of women in the past, the woman teacher is self-conscious about broadening the authority group in the classroom, including students as significant sources of approval and intellectual validation for their peers. Wary of the pitfalls of competitive hierarchical modes of evaluation and judgment, she is likely to foster collaborative learning and shared responsibility for measuring achievement. Intellectually rigorous about uncovering the cultural biases that may mar our generalizations, she'll try to illuminate differences in her students as much as she promotes a sense of community in her classroom.

These gestures are certainly restorative; they clearly have as their goal a movement away from the temporary inequality of teacher/student toward a recognition of shared authority. Taken together they point to what is perhaps our largest single assumption about the college classroom--that is, that in this privileged space we can reverse, or at least suspend, the

consequences of our culture's differential socialization of women and men. Higher education has always claimed as an ideal the liberation from unconscious socialization. As Woodrow Wilson said in 1916 "the use of a university is to make young gentlemen as unlike their fathers as possible."(6) To realize this goal, however, to make men truly unlike their fathers, we now see, they need to know much more about their mothers. That task is monumental. To find an accurate image of our mothers, we must risk losing the image of ourselves constructed through the traditional curriculum. Women and other subordinate groups have so fully internalized the dominant group's definition of their being that the process of becoming self-conscious can feel initially like denying what they know as their identity. A student may be extremely fearful of relinquishing the invisible paradigms of personal definition absorbed in her educational socialization because these seem, quite literally, all that she knows about herself.

With so much conscious attention given in the woman-focused classroom to correcting and completing the earlier flawed paradigms, why does resistance still block empowerment? We believe it's because we've underestimated the profoundly radical undertaking that curriculum transformation truly is and the deep psychological investment we all have, even against our will, in the old invisible paradigms. When we try to implement new modes of learning that are congruent with our analysis of the necessarily inclusive shape of knowledge on the transformed syllabus, we must confront again how the same powers that shaped

the syllabus have shaped us and shaped our expectations of the educational process.

Conflict as an agent for change

What's to be done with these important recognitions gained in the last decade of teaching in women-focused classrooms? We'd like to return to our earlier axiom: When women enter the classroom, there's sure to be trouble, whether they appear on the syllabus, in the role of teacher, or as students. Serious attention to women's presence exposes the fact that conflict is inherent in the process of a truly liberalizing education and that meaningful intellectual debate is always accompanied by affect. Yet conflict is feared and disguised not only by most women but by most academics. We'd recommend making a place in the classroom for the emotions, including anger.(7) As teachers we need to acknowledge more openly that transforming the curriculum is asking of ourselves and our students that we transform the conception of self at its deepest unconscious level as well as at the level of intellectual assent.

It's our conviction that we haven't adequately named, thus made available for transformation, nearly enough of what goes on in the classroom. For us this means that when we employ new strategies for organizing knowledge on our syllabus, for exercising our authority, or when we ask students to take a self-conscious stance toward their socialization, that we be more candid about the conflict we produce. If we identify conflict, as Jean Baker Miller suggests, with process, with the potential

for change,(8) fewer students--men as well as women--will fear it. Openly acknowledged conflict is the expression of movement, the outward sign of the necessary condition for re-vision of the status quo.

In naming the opposing forces that make up the process of change, we may give our students access to the sources of their own resistance. Further, we may become more self-conscious about our own, often unwitting, collusion in clinging to these paradigms ourselves.

II. CHANGING THE INSTITUTION

Change in a context of crisis

Transforming institutional structures in order to translate the insights or feminist scholarship and pedagogy effectively is a particularly difficult task at this historical moment. If there is conflict in the classroom, there is crisis in the institution, a context of crisis that imperils progressive change.

Budget cuts, retrenchment, a steady-state faculty, a shrinking pool of applicants, the changing expectations of women and men students: the crises that beset American higher education in the eighties have led administrators to convene long-range planning committees, revise mission statements and call for a clearer definition or the curriculum. In response many faculty members have become protective of their own turf

and, in looking for models to shape the curriculum, have turned back to the core curricula of the 50's to guide them in their reaction against the seeming fragmentation of the 60's and 70's.

Nostalgia for the exclusionary core curricula of the 50's, like all forms of nostalgia, has a pernicious effect on the present moment and distorts our understanding of the more recent past. Except for a nod to computer literacy and quantitative skills, the core of some new curricular plans replicates the assumption of the old core: that the history, experience and achievements of powerful, white, Western males define the heart of our knowledge, of what we must know to be considered educated. As Rhoda Dorsey, president of Goucher College, pointed out recently,(9) the core curriculum of the 50's was fashioned for predominantly male G.I.'s returning from World War II. It was designed and implemented by the influx of male faculty members also returning from the war or just completing doctorates under the G.I. bill. The 50's core curriculum is predicated on an insider/outsider structure that marginalizes or makes "recommended but not required" the experience of women, Blacks, ethnic minorities, subordinate classes. There is, undeniably, a need for a new structure in the curriculum. But a new core needs to build on the lessons of diversity and difference of the last two decades and respond to the needs of today's students. In designing a progressive rather than a nostalgic core curriculum, we must pay attention to how we teach and whom we teach as well as what we teach.

Women's studies and transformation: internal paradoxes

As faculty members retreat to a defensive departmental posture and jockey for a secure place within new destribution requirements and core curricula, scholars and teachers committed to the study of women's experience are pulled in several directions. Women's studies faculty need to look both inward and outward as we seek to make the curriculum more responsive to women's experience, as we try to secure a place for ourselves within our institutions, and as we imagine alternatives to the institutional structures that have excluded women in the past.

Perhaps the central paradox we all face is that we are trying to fight the marginalization of women's experience (and issues or race, class and sexuality) in the academy and yet it is through our unwanted marginality that we forged our basic strength. Our vantage point, our angle of vision outside the conventional disciplines and curriculum allows us to see differently and to see more. Few of us would want to reify our marginality, but we should not lose the vitality of the critical stance it provides.

As we strive to assure our legitimacy within the academy, we are confronted with another seemingly impossible contradiction: to survive we must be acceptable, yet the terms that have defined what is acceptable are the same terms that have excluded us. On a practical level we need access to the resources and power that run our institutions, but in seeking legitimacy we need to remind

ourselves that changing the fundamental terms of legitimacy is one of our long-term objectives.

As the classroom experience bears out, new models of teaching and designing courses actually intensify the most tenacious problems of the old paradigms even as we try to overcome them. Overt resistance is fairly easy to predict. But covert resistance is much more difficult to define and understand: this may include resistance to the authority of women, to non-hierarchical, non-linear structures, to new institutional alternatives to the conventional departmental structure.

These forms of resistance are further complicated by the rising expectations that many of us are encountering in our younger women students. Their confidence is both a measure of past success and an obstacle to future progress. Because women's issues are broadly (if superficially) discussed, students, particularly white, heterosexual, middle class students, genuinely believe the problem of women's exclusion or subordination was taken care of in the 70's. They are blocked in understanding or even hearing an analysis that questions the smugness of what the media would like to promote as a post-feminist generation. Our students' smugness about the opportunities that await them may merely mask a more profound anxiety about survival and success in the world of work as well as in personal relationships.

As we review the current crises in higher education and examine the internal paradoxes of women's studies faculty, we would argue that the most creative resolution to these paradoxes is demonstrated by curriculum transformation projects because they can provide models for curricular change and for institutional change as well.

A false dichotomy between women's studies departments and curriculum transformation projects threatens to divide us and to promote a competition that can only deplete our resources and benefit those who would like to minimize the study of women in the curriculum.(10) We want to reach more than the self-selected group of students who take our women's studies courses, and by recognizing their need and interest, are already partially transformed. Further, it seems intellectually irresponsible to allow an increasingly tenured faculty whose primary research will never be on women to continue teaching for the foreseeable future as though scholarship on women and an informing feminist perspective did not exist.

It's important not to confuse transformation of the academic disciplines and institutional power structures with mere assimilation or what's most affordable or readily acceptable of women's studies. We need to be particularly insistent that what we have to offer is an inclusive vision of the complexity of gender as a category of analysis, not merely white women's studies. We need to be clear that race and class are not merely adjuncts, liberal afterthoughts to a concern for gender, but the essential means for understanding the diversity of women's

experience, and the experience of other subordinate groups. We need to protect and speak up for our own often silenced minorities, such as lesbians, and not allow their presence and identities to be submerged in the name of short-term political compromises.

The experience of the past decade and of emerging curriculum transformation projects has shown that effective transformation is impossible without a base of researchers and teachers whose primary concern is women; similarly, women's studies departments and programs become marginalized and risk having little effect on the experience of most students if they are not linked to curriculum transformation projects.(11)

Curriculum transformation projects: the first stage

Over fifty colleges and universities have at least the rudiments of curriculum transformation projects. Though they vary in format and intent, most of these projects share certain significant characteristics.

First, all of the projects we know of have been externally funded by NEH, FIPSE, Ford, Mellon, WEEAP, Carnegie, for example, usually for a two or three year period at most. Because true transformation is a long-range undertaking and must be ongoing to be effective, and because external sources of funding are drying up, we need to institutionalize the means for continuing transformation. We need to ask college presidents, for example, if the commitment to research and teaching about women that is

easy to articulate when an outside funding agency is paying for it will become an integral part of fund-raising objectives, appeals to alumni donors, and part of the operating budget when no more grants are forthcoming.

A second element common to all projects is faculty development. In an era of steady-state faculty, colleges can't depend on new people or outsiders to effect the kind of fundamental long-range change these models aim for. Some plans include only tenured faculty on the assumption that these are the people with the longest range commitment to the institution and with the level of responsibility and power over the curriculum necessary to make changes. This may, however, further isolate and alienate junior faculty. Further, junior faculty members most frequently staff the basic courses of departments that need to be transformed in order to touch the greatest number of students.

A primary vehicle for faculty development on many campuses has been a seminar or workshop. The most effective of these seminars have been interdisciplinary and ongoing (in the summer or through the term, supported by released time or a stipend to participants). This environment frees faculty members from a narrow departmental perspective. In interdisciplinary study and work groups, faculty members become engaged in a common intellectual undertaking in which they can exercise their own expertise, develop new ideas and attempt to establish a mutually intelligible vocabulary. Many seminars include visiting outside experts, putting faculty in commerce with leaders in women's

scholarship. Visits from outsiders can validate local feminist faculty members. Faculty members whose research and teaching are women-focused have to be central to any form of transformation project and not used merely in a consulting role. They need to be visible leaders with administrative authority.

The seminars which produced the most lasting consequences have required some tangible product of participants: a syllabus to be implemented within the next year, a paper, or participation in a new, shared teaching experience. This assures making the newly learned material their own through teaching it, and prompts a degree of reflection to help faculty members analyze the process or change, including their own resistance and incentive for development. Since the curriculum is at the heart of a college's mission and depends on institutional support systems, the most strategic plans also involve administrators, librarians and other non-faculty personnel so that they are both informed and engaged in what is ultimately an institution-wide effort.

A final element shared by all projects is a concern to assure progeny. The long-range nature of curriculum transformation requires that some means be found to continue to involve more faculty and administrators in the enterprise. Realizable short-term goals (changing a specific syllabus, mounting a seminar around a certain set of issues) should not be confused with the long-term objective of involving ever increasing numbers of faculty members in projects that will help them inform their courses and teaching through feminist scholarship.

Curriculum transformation comes of age: three models

Women's studies has always claimed as an explicit goal the transformation of the academy, the person, and the society. As an agent for change, a women's studies perspective has been particularly acute in analyzing access to power and the assignment of values. As we seek to imagine alternative ways to reconstitute the curriculum and the academy, we want to take time to reflect on the models being tested in transformation projects across the country. We've oversimplified the necessarily complex and diverse strategies employed by each group undertaking transformation work within very different institutions, with marked differences in local resources and political climates. Our analysis is constantly being refined and clarified through discussion with participants in these projects. Our effort here is descriptive, not prescriptive. Each model has its strengths and inherent risks. We've tried to clarify options for those committed to this work and to share successful strategies. A review of the fifty or so curriculum projects in women's colleges and co-ed institutions, in both the public and private sector, would suggest three primary models that have been tried in the last few years.

1. A top-down model centered on an administrative directive to make sweeping changes in the curriculum by integrating introductory courses in all departments or otherwise affecting a significant number of basic courses.

2. A piggy-back model in which interdisciplinary courses or

programs already sanctioned within the institutional agenda are targeted as the best way to begin curriculum transformation and to reach a broad range of faculty.

3. A bottom-up coordination or consortial model that originates with faculty and student interest and seeks to highlight, connect and maximize internal resources and to do faculty outreach.

In thinking about these models we asked how each would answer these questions: Who can change? Where is the locus for change? What are the incentives for change? and how do we evaluate change? In seeking answers to these questions we've tried to bring into view the assumptions and priorities, the invisible paradigms, that may govern the outcomes of these important experiments.

Two projects that illustrate the top-down model are the FIPSE-funded Wheaton Experiment ("Toward a Balanced Curriculum: Integrating the Study of Women into the Liberal Arts") that will come to completion in 1983, and the "Project on Women in the Curriculum" at Montana State University funded initially for two years by WEEAP, and followed by a FIPSE grant to coordinate efforts at other institutions in the Northern Rockies region.

Both had sweeping mandates: for Wheaton, "to integrate scholarship about women into the whole curriculum," for MSU "to eliminate sex bias from the curriculum." A distinguishing characteristic of this model is the locus for change. They operate within the departmental or divisional structure with

special focus on the introductory courses within departments. This is partly determined by a desire to reach as many students and faculty as possible, as quickly as possible. The implied assumption here is that the answer to "who can change" is "everybody should." Because Wheaton is a small college and the study of women is clearly linked to their mission as a women's college, they did try to involve everyone in one way or another. Individual faculty members and departments could define programs or events suited to their needs as a means of implementation, and about half the faculty and most departments have been touched by the project in three years. As a large state university, MSU targeted and selected faculty to participate in a seminar in which they would produce new syllabi for their introductory or survey courses and a paper analyzing the experience, from the beginning of the seminar through evaluating students' reactions to their revised courses. MSU defined "who can change" as faculty who were committed to curricular revision of some sort and who had power over the shape of basic departmental courses. Their participants were not necessarily faculty who were already engaged in research or teeaching about women.

The targeting of introductory-level courses, working within the departmental structure, and the broad mandate that characterize the top-down model serve to bring into sharp relief tenacious paradigms that have been invisible or at least obscured. First, the conventional introductory course in traditional departments is probably the hardest to transform. These are the courses designed to introduce students to the

material and methodology of a discipline. To transform their assumptions and organization requires rethinking the entire discipline.

A second discovery is that using the departmental structure as a locus for change is not enough. Because this model is often adopted by institutions that have no core of women's studies faculty at the start, they discover they've tried to skip a step that is essential to effective transformation: the creation of women-focused courses that don't fit departmental categories. The presence of interdisciplinary courses in feminist theory or focused on women's experience are essential for providing not only data but strategies and theory for rethinking conventional courses. Although some of these projects, particularly those that require tangible products of faculty participants, do succeed in transforming some basic courses, the most positive outcome is likely to be creation of a network of faculty members who might begin to provide the missing step: women-focused and feminist theory courses, an unexpected but welcome outcome at both Wheaton and MSU.

The top-down model almost inevitably generates faculty resistance and even backlash against being told what and how to teach. The most effective strategy for avoiding that resistance is to minimize the top-down nature of the project by making participation voluntary and soliciting a wide-range of faculty-designed proposals to compete for available resources, another successful strategy developed at both Wheaton and MSU.

Projects structured along the lines of the second, piggy-back, model hope ultimately to transform the whole curriculum, but take as the locus for change a course or department that already stands outside the conventional disciplines and also enjoys a privileged place in the institution's established agenda. Whereas the first model begins with a departmental base, this model is interdepartmental or interdisciplinary at the start. At Lewis and Clark, a small private co-ed liberal arts college in Oregon, the General Studies program was chosen for their project because it is interdisciplinary, multicultural and involves a large number of faculty who teach in teams. The objective was to train faculty participants who would bring their new knowledge back to the General Studies Program, and who would in turn teach with others in that common enterprise and teach them what they'd gained in the seminar. The program organizers hoped that faculty participants would also spontaneously transform their upper division courses.

The Lewis and Clark organizers decided to start with more or less self-selected faculty who had at least curiosity if not actual knowledge about scholarship on women. They hoped to measure their success by monitoring syllabi and attempting to assess attitudinal change. What unexpectedly emerged from their project was a very useful scale that measures changes in academic disciplines rather than changes in the attitudes of individual faculty members. The scale ranges from a first level where "The absence of women in the discipline is not noted. There is no

consciousness that the male experience is a 'particular knowleage' selected from a wider universe or possible knowledge and experience..." to a fifth level where women's legitimacy in the discipline is established through "a bi-focal or two-sex perspective." The Lewis and Clark scale resembles the interactive phases defined by Peggy McIntosh and those initially proposed by Gerda Lerner for women's history at the Berkshire conference on women's history in 1974.(12)

The Lewis and Clark self-assessment revealed an even more startling invisible paradigm. The college, which had a long, proud history of co-education, had unwittingly been teaching two curricula, one for men and another for women. Entering male and female freshmen had indistinguishable aptitude scores and high school records. Yet their course and major selections over the next four years reinforced sex-role stereotypes. The college began to question whether such patterns reflected genuine co-education.

Another piggy-back project is underway at Alverno College in Milwaukee. Alverno is a small, Catholic women's college with a large number of older "returning" students. Their locus for change is an important interdisciplinary program, the Social Sciences and Policy Studies Department, which designed a three-year, Carnegie-funded mainstreaming project. Here the locus for change was less the faculty than students whom they hoped to change by engaging them more directly in a participatory learning/teaching process. They redesigned their courses so that students study their own relatives, neighborhoods, cities, and

the public policies that affect them in order to learn about the structure or public policy and to use social science methodology. Explicitly using gender as a category of analysis helped them make two important discoveries. First, students became more personally engaged in their learning and became more politically active by transgressing the conventional boundaries between the classroom and the world, intellectual reflection and political action. Second, issues even the organizers had initially perceived as gender-neutral (urban policies in housing and transportation, for example) were found to have differential impact on men and women. The Alverno project, like one at Stephens College in Missouri, explicitly recognized that by transforming the curriculum they hope to have an impact on the world and the way their women students act in the world. The two projects try to empower women to become active agents in their communities. The most clear advantage of the piggy-back model is the legitimacy and visibility afforded by association with a requirement or program that is already strong and central to the institution's curriculum. A risk with this model is that the program or core courses it targets will swallow up the entire integration effort. If faculty members change their view of their disciplines, however, they can carry what they've learned into their other courses. This translation requires conscious eencouragement. The model also points to further ways to "piggy-back" institution-wide development efforts. For example, programs to improve writing across the curriculum or to develop computer literacy should also be linked to women's studies integration.

The third, bottom-up, model presupposes a network, however loosely defined, of feminist scholars, women-focused courses and other resources. All the questions--who can change, what is the locus for change, what stimulates change and how do we measure it--are answered differently than for the other two models. This model takes as its immediate objective to make visible and accessible all the resources within a region or institution that facilitate curriculum transformation in order to create a community for previously dispersed feminist scholars and teachers and then to include others who are new to women's research and teaching in that community. The Great Lakes Colleges Association program in women's studies exemplifies this model on a regional scale; the course-cluster curriculum experiment at Smith, sponsored by the Mellon-funded Project on Women and Social Change, has used this model on an institutional level.

In a sense both of these projects attempt to create a new locus in which to operate and effect change. Just as the first model is departmental, targeting introductory courses, and the second is interdepartmental, this model is counter or extra-departmental and focuses on epistemology. In the Great Lakes Colleges Association this meant creating a formal network within an existing association of twelve colleges to share resources and to encourage exchange among scholars and teachers working on women who had been isolated in small, independent colleges. Further, they started an annual conference on epistemology and curriculum design that brings together administrators, researchers and librarians, as well as faculty

from the twelve colleges and also includes people from outside the region. That mix enhances local faculty development and also serves to make the Great Lakes Colleges Association more visible nationally.

The Smith program builds on a base of faculty whose research and teaching had been women-focused but who had been separated by the departmental structure. We needed to build a more formal community for interdisciplinary exchange among these teachers who, while very well-informed about scholarship on women in their field, had no ongoing forum in which to compare conclusions in their courses. Our conscious goal was also that this extra-departmental community would foster progeny, enable us to reach out in a non-threatening way to faculty unfamiliar with the questions that work on women raises and engage them in collaborative learning and trial teaching in interdisciplinary teams.

The primary mechanism for achieving that goal has been to identify four intermediate courses each spring semester already offered in separate departments and to link them with a public lecture and discussion series on a common research theme: Women and Power the first year, Women: Image and Identity the second. Twenty-five to thirty faculty members from fourteen departments volunteered to plan the series and team teach the discussion sections. Our intention to form a new community also brought about a new extra-departmental classroom through the lectures and discussions. All of our lecturers explicitly identified the invisible paradigms of their disciplines--how the framing of

research questions, assumptions about appropriate methods, valid evidence, generalizable conclusions tended to obscure women's experience. We chose the intermediate level courses in order to focus on questions of epistemology: how do we know what we know? how must disciplinary methodologies change to account more fully for women's experience? The means of knowing and our methodology are the most well-disguised paradigms of all. To bring those paradigms to the surface is the single most empowering strategy we could devise to help our students--and colleagues--become transforming agents in other classrooms. Just as the lectures helped us critique methodology, the discussion sessions helped us rethink our pedagogy and the paradigms of power in the classroom.

What are the tangible transformative outcomes of our model? Once we recognize the invisible paradigms involved in the organization of knowledge, our means of knowing, forms of teaching, talking to each other, then conscious choices for change are possible. Change for us required new contexts for teaching and learning because we agreed we couldn't understand women's experience, and the diversity of racial, ethnic, cultural experience within gender, through a single discipline. Knowing <u>how</u> we learned helped us finally unearth and dislodge the invisible paradigms of each syllabus we designed.

After two years on grant money, the program has now been institutionalized as a standing faculty committee with its own modest budget and will continue with faculty development seminars as well as a yearly course cluster. Spawned by a need to work around rather than through conventional structures, this model is

particularly useful as a base for imagining alternatives to those structures which tend not only to isolate individuals but to fragment knowledge.

Conclusion

Whether located within departmental structures, in concert with pre-existing interdisciplinary programs, or in new structures outside the usual avenues of curriculum design, the experience of all of these models has shown that when real transformation begins to happen we become even more aware of the breadth and tenacity of the invisible paradigms of our institutions, disciplines, social and psychological constructions. We need to recognize, in short, the pervasive and unconscious forms in which the dominant culture is reproduced in the classroom, even as we have as our conscious goal to transform that culture's understanding of women.

Footnotes

1. Toward a New Psychology of Women, Chapter 1, (Beacon Press, 1976), pp. 3-12.

2. For the differential treatment of women and men in the classroom see Bernice R. Sandler, "The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women?" compiled by the Project on the Status and Education of Women in 1981 and available from the Association of American Colleges.

3. For an extended analysis of this phenomenon, see "The Politics of Nurturance" by Margo Culley, Arlyn Diamond, Lee Edwards, Sarah Lennox, Cathy Portuges of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. This essay will appear in Feminist Pedagogy Reader, a forthcoming anthology edited by Culley and Portuges (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983).

4. See her article by this title in the special issue of Women's Studies Quarterly devoted to curriculum transformation, (Spring 1982), 28-31.

5. See Elizabeth Tidball's important essays in Educational Record 54 (Spring 1973), 130-135, and in Signs, 5:3 (Spring, 1980), 504-517. She confirmed at a conference at Skidmore College ("Towards an Equitable Education for Women and Men") that a significant positive statistical correlation continues to exist between the presence of women faculty at women's colleges and the

high production ot women achievers among their graduates.

6. In his address to a YMCA rally, quoted by John Schilb in "Men's Studies and Women's Studies," Change (April 1982), 38-41.

7. Vicky Spelman develops the sources of anger in the classroom and strategies for engaging emotions productively in "Combating the Marginalization ot Black Women in the Classroom," Women's Studies Quarterly (Summer 1982), 15-16.

8. Toward a New Psychology of Women, p. 126.

9. Rhoda Dorsey, President of Goucher College, in remarks at the opening panel of a conference at Skidmore College March 11-12, 1983: "Towards Equitable Education for Women and Men: Models from the Last Decade."

10 For an analysis of the problems the term "mainstreaming" poses see Peggy McIntosh "Notes on Terminology" in Women's Studies Quarterly (Summer, 1983), 29-30.

11 Directory of Programs: Transforming the Liberal Arts Curriculum Through Incorporation of New Scholarship on Women compiled by Peggy McIntosh, Director, Faculty Development Program, Wellesley Center for Research on Women, assisted by Katherine Stanis and Barbara Kneubuhl. The Directory is available for $2.00 from the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA 02181

See also the special issues on curriculum transformation in Women's Studies Quarterly (Spring 1982), and Change (April, 1982).

12 Scale developed by Mary Kay Tetreault, Elizabeth Arch, and Susan Kirschner; Lewis and Clark College. See also Gerda Lerner "Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges," in The Majority Finds Its Past (Oxford University Press: 1979), and Peggy McIntosh's presentation at the June 1983 conference "Toward a Balanced Curriculum" in the forthcoming proceedings of the Wheaton conference.

Our insights were deepened by personal communications from Bonnie Spanier (Wheaton), Betty Schmitz, John Ramage and Ray Pratt (Montana State University), Susan Kirschner (Lewis and Clark), Greta Salem and Stephen Sharkey (Alverno College) and Beth Reed (Great Lakes Colleges Association) and by articles submitted by some of them for our forthcoming anthology on curriculum transformation.